

**Amendments to the Specification:**

On the first page beneath the title and above the heading, BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION, please insert the following new section:

**CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS**

This application is a 371 of PCT patent application No. PCT/US2004/034596 filed October 19, 2004, which PCT application claims priority from U.S. patent application serial No. 10/691,052 filed October 22, 2003 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,078,443).

Please cancel paragraph [0033] from the original PCT specification as-filed, and insert the following replacement paragraph therefor:

[0033] The blowing agent component is preferably water, preferably distilled, deionized water to prevent unwanted impurities from entering the foaming composition and/or interfering with the foam reaction. Water can be used as the blowing agent advantageously in an amount of 1-3 (or about 1-3) parts by weight of the Part B composition of Table 1. The water reacts with the isocyanate component from the Part A composition to produce CO<sub>2</sub> (via a catalyzed mechanism using the catalysts described above). The production and expansion of CO<sub>2</sub> is responsible for foaming and expansion of the reacting mixture as is generally understood by persons of ordinary skill in the art. Less preferably, other suitable blowing agents could be used.

Please cancel paragraph [0034] from the original PCT specification as-filed, and insert the following replacement paragraph therefor:

[0034] The black paste component is a conventional carbon-based pigment in a polyether or polyester carrier known in the art. Preferably the black paste has an OH number of about 20-150. The black paste provides pigmentation to the finished foam product. The Part B composition can include about 1-6 parts by weight black paste.

Please cancel paragraph [0048] from the original PCT specification as-filed, and insert the following replacement paragraph therefor:

[0048] In another experiment, foam according to the invention was compared to EPS to test break-through acceleration and percent compression versus impact velocity according to ASTM F2040. In this experiment, the Foam No. 2 from Table 2 in Example 1 was used and compared to EPS. The test samples for each of the invented and EPS foams were square samples measuring 5.5" x 5.5" x 1" thick. The tests were conducted first using a flat circular impactor having a 4-inch diameter, and then using a spherical impactor that also had a 4-inch diameter. The results are provided in Figs. 1-2 and 3-4 for the flat and spherical impactors respectively. As can be seen from Fig. 1, using the flat impactor the invented foam exhibited significantly less breakthrough acceleration than EPS for impact velocities from 2 to about 6.5 m/s (i.e. resulting from unabsorbed energy which was transmitted through the foam); the invented foam exhibited about 50% less breakthrough acceleration measured in g's from 2 to about 6 m/s. As also seen in Fig. 1, using the flat impactor the foam exhibited about 100 g's of breakthrough acceleration at an impact speed of about 2 meters per second, and about 150 g's of breakthrough acceleration at an impact speed of about 6 meters per second. Also, from Fig. 2, using the flat impactor the invented foam exhibited a greater degree of compression compared to EPS across the entire tested range of impact velocities, from 2 to about 6.5 m/s. This may help explain why the resulting breakthrough acceleration was lower for the invented foam than for the EPS as described above. It is also noteworthy that following the impact tests, the invented foam recovered to substantially 100% of its initial volume and shape with no or negligible noticeable loss of rigidity or strength. Whereas, after each impact, the EPS was irreversibly crushed and was replaced with a fresh EPS test foam in order to conduct an additional impact test at a different impact velocity.